

E 713

A 37

~~1898~~

7
75
E 713
.A37
Copy 1

D. S. Alexander 1000

H. F. R

PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF HAWAII.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. D. S. ALEXANDER,
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1898.

WASHINGTON.
1898.

17
H. A. L. 110

72325

SPEECH
OF
HON. D. S. ALEXANDER.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. R. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. ALEXANDER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, for the first time in our history, is presented to us as a war necessity. Their strategic features have long been understood. Ever since steam supplanted wind these islands have been recognized as the only bridge over which the vast Pacific could be safely passed by a fleet of modern war vessels. The cession of Pearl Harbor was advocated because it was the key to the full defense of our western shore and because that key should rest only in the grasp of the United States.

Naval officers have written, and their readers have believed, that under present conditions it is not practicable for any trans-Pacific nation to invade our western coast without occupying Hawaii as a base, and for years it has been admitted that it would be vastly easier to defend these islands by preoccupying and fortifying them. It has been demonstrated by the highest naval experts that a navy sufficient to protect our Pacific coast would also be ample to protect these islands, for in the event of war Hawaii must be occupied by the United States not only for a base, but to prevent an enemy from using it against us as his base. In a war neutrals would not prevent belligerents from taking possession of it.

All this has long been known. There is not a word written or spoken to-day in favor of the annexation of these islands that has not often been heard during the past thirty years. Yet not until

we are in the presence of necessities growing out of actual war are these facts sufficiently and fully realized and appreciated to arouse the country to proper action. Necessity is not more the mother of invention than it is the schoolmaster of a great people. To-day we need the Hawaiian Islands much more than they ever needed us. Since the splendid achievement of Admiral Dewey Hawaii has become as absolutely necessary to the successful conduct of war as it has heretofore appeared to be necessary in the theories of astute strategists. And yet the reasons for annexation are no stronger or truer to-day than they were a year ago.

A STARTLING ADMISSION.

A few weeks ago I listened with great interest to the able speech of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] in opposition to the annexation of Hawaii. It was forceful and highly patriotic and will take its place among the best speeches delivered on the negative of this question. But at the very outset he made an admission, almost startling, coming from him, that "the very few of our countrymen who have given any attention to the subject are inclined to favor annexation!" Is the converse of this proposition also true? Are we to understand from the gentleman that those of our countrymen who have given no attention to the subject are inclined to oppose annexation?

I do not charge this as true, although the gentleman from Indiana seems to admit it, but I do believe that the better informed one becomes upon this subject the more inclined he is to accept annexation as the only wise and patriotic escape from the present situation.

JAPAN'S INCREASING INFLUENCE.

The question is not only, Shall we annex Hawaii? but, Are we willing to allow some other nation to annex it? Whatever may be the declarations or political intentions of the Japanese Government as a Government, it is no longer a secret that the people of Hawaii are in danger of passing under the domination of Japan "by a peaceful process," as Captain Mahan says, "of overrunning and assimilation." For several months during 1896 and 1897 the Japanese entered Hawaii at the rate of 2,000 per month, until now they number 25,000, or nearly one-quarter of the total population. When Hawaii attempts to stay such an inva-

sion by a resort to laws similar to our own against contract laborers and paupers, Japan refuses to recognize its right so to legislate and demands unrestricted immigration.

Add to this demand the tremendous leap which Japan has taken within the past two years, becoming a recognized great power of the Pacific, if not of the world, and it is easy to understand why the conditions and attitude of Japan have changed quickly and radically with respect to Hawaii. If these changing conditions are permitted to go on, it is only a question of time, and possibly of very short time, how soon the supremacy of Japan will be completed.

THE WORK OF THE ANGLO-SAXON.

This fact, if unaccepted or disregarded by the people of the United States, is fully and startlingly recognized by the Anglo-Saxon residents and their supporters, who have given to Hawaii its civilization, its schools, its churches, its commerce, and its great producing capacity, who own more than three-fourths of all the property of the country, who have transferred to it the institutions, the laws, and the helpful civilizing influences of America, filling the land with railroads, cars, engines, waterworks, telephones, and all the latest inventions, improvements, and conveniences, which aid in making our country so desirable and so progressive.

These 8,000 Americans, English, and Germans, who have accomplished all this and more, will not suffer themselves to be swallowed up by the civilization of a remote East whose standards of living are so much lower than ours that satisfactory existence to them is equivalent to destitution and despair to us. These people have not toiled and endured privations for two generations, turning Hawaii into a garden spot, rich in everything that makes home and life desirable, only at last to have it fall into the possession of Japan, either by the fiat of Government or by its inundation with orientalism.

THEIR OFFER AND THEIR APPEAL.

These heroic souls, backed by a large proportion of native Hawaiians, are now facing this problem. They offer to us four and one-half millions of acres, an extent of territory larger than Con-

nectient and Rhode Island combined, which are practically owned as well as governed by a people who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.

Under laws similar to those in the United States they are striving to hold back the flow of oriental immigration, that these favored isles of the sea may come to the great Republic as free as possible from Asiatic influences: they appeal to us to study and understand the seriousness of their situation and the importance to us of their country: they call attention to the fact that Hawaii imports more of the products of the United States than any other country bordering on the Pacific; that it bought more largely in 1896 than any other nation save Australia; that it was the second largest wine customer, the third best purchaser of salmon and barley, and the sixth best purchaser of American flour: that twice as many American vessels visit Hawaii in the course of a year as enter any other country on the globe; that in all the ports of Europe in 1896 the American flag floated at the masthead of only 30 ships, that in the ports of Asia it was seen flying from the topmasts of but 98 ships, that in all the ports of the United Kingdom our flag flying from the mast of a ship could be counted but 88 times, while in the ports of Hawaii it floated gracefully in the trade winds from the mainmasts of 191 vessels.

THE NEED OF A STRONG ARM.

The whole trend of trade, of law, of government, and of thought is American. The President of the Republic, who is a type of the men responsible for this wonderful growth, is a native of Hawaii and the son of two Maine missionaries, who went to the Sandwich Islands in the early decades of the century to aid in the work of civilization. For the last five years these people have desired to fly our flag, to give us their sovereignty, to accept our laws, and to obey our commands: but they can not continue this invitation forever.

The need of some strong arm to uphold them is apparent. With the eyes of Japan fixed in deadly fascination upon their country, backed by its new life born of successful war, by its powerful navy sweeping in broadening circles about their domain, by its modern steel guns ranged upon their one great city, and, worse than all, by its commercial element already settled in position to

compete with and gradually destroy its merchants, these people are compelled to come to us or to go elsewhere to prevent being swallowed up by the Orient.

ENGLAND WILLING TO TAKE THEM.

Where else can they go? It is an open secret that England, like Barkis, is perfectly willing. Under the English flag their property, their civilization, their laws, everything they hold dear and wish to conserve, will be entirely secure. No oriental or other power ever treads on that flag. Once under its folds, Hawaii would form a part of the great Anglo-Saxon community growing up in the Pacific Ocean. Australia, larger than the United States if we except Alaska, with its wonderful resources, developed and undeveloped, stops the flow of two oceans under the Southern Cross. To the north and east a whole fleet of islands, marshaled as if for war, are flying the same flag and controlled by the same world-inspiring, progress-making people. Between that fleet of islands and British America is Hawaii, affording the only port between Asia and America where a ton of coal or a barrel of water can be obtained.

Would England reject this Gibraltar of the Pacific? Not while the spirit of commerce guides the statesmen who define her policy throughout the world and the keen eye of its admiralty office conserves her interests by providing in times of peace greater security and advantage for times of war.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The question, therefore, presents itself, shall America or England accept the invitation of this Anglo-Saxon blood that is holding Hawaii to-day against the progressive, commercial, and national spirit which dominates this New World power that is projected into the domain of international politics?

For more than fifty years we have maintained that these islands are more nearly related to us than to any other nation and that no power should take possession of or control them. In 1842 Mr. Webster, then Secretary of State, in replying to the application of the Hawaiian Government for recognition, wrote as follows:

The President is of opinion that the interests of all the commercial nations require that that Government (Hawaii) shall not be interfered with by foreign powers. The United States are more interested in the fate of the islands

and of their Government than any other nation can be, and this consideration induces the President to be quite willing to declare, as the sense of the Government of the United States, that the Government of the Sandwich Islands must not be interfered with as a conquest or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing Government or any exclusive privileges or preferences in matters of commerce.

In 1843, after England had seized the islands, Mr. Legare, then Secretary of State under President Polk, wrote the United States minister at London as follows:

It is well known that we have no wish to plant or to acquire colonies abroad. Yet there is something so entirely peculiar in the relations between this little Commonwealth, Hawaii, and ourselves that we might even feel justified, consistently with our own principles, in interfering by force to prevent its falling into the hands of one of the great powers of Europe. These relations spring out of the local situation, the history and the character and institutions of the Hawaiian Islands, as well as out of the declarations formally made by this Government during the course of the last session of Congress, to which I beg leave to call your particular attention.

If the attempts now making by ourselves as well as other Christian powers to open the markets of China to a more general commerce be successful, there can be no doubt but that a great part of that commerce will find its way over the isthmus. In that event it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the Hawaiian group as a stage in the long voyage between Asia and America. But without anticipating events which, however, seem inevitable and even approaching, the actual demands of an immense navigation make the free use of these roadsteads and ports indispensable to us. It seems doubtful whether even the undisputed possession of the Oregon Territory and the use of the Columbia River, or indeed anything short of the acquisition of California (if that were possible), would be sufficient indemnity to us for the loss of these harbors.

In 1849, when the French showed a disposition hostile to the Hawaiian Government, Mr. Buchanan, then Secretary of State, sent the following dispatch to the United States minister resident at Honolulu:

We ardently desire that the Hawaiian Islands may maintain their independence. It would be highly injurious to our interests if, tempted by their weakness, they should be seized by Great Britain or France; more especially so since our recent acquisitions from Mexico on the Pacific Ocean.

Again, in 1850, Secretary of State Clayton, and later, in 1851, Mr. Webster addressed the United States minister at Paris, their language having no uncertain meaning. Mr. Webster, referring to the further demands against Hawaii, said:

A step like this could not fail to be viewed by the Government and people of the United States with a dissatisfaction which would tend seriously to disturb our existing friendly relations with the French Government.

A few months later, upon hearing that the French still threat-

ened Hawaii, Mr. Webster wrote as follows to the American consul at Honolulu:

I trust the French will not take possession; but if they do, they will be dislodged, if my advice is taken, if the whole power of the Government is required to do it.

From that day to this our Government has maintained the same position respecting these islands, and are we now to be told that we do not wish to increase our Navy to defend them, or our appropriations to fortify them? That in order to avoid entangling alliances with other countries we must refuse to make Hawaii a part of our territory? Is it no longer true, as Mr. Webster said, that "the United States are more interested in the fate of the islands and of their government than any other nation can be?" Was Secretary Legare wrong when he said that "it will be impossible to overrate the importance of the Hawaiian group as a stage in the long voyage between Asia and America?"

Shall it be said that Secretary Clayton was misinformed when he proclaimed the fact that "the situation of the Sandwich Islands in respect to our possessions on the Pacific and the commercial bonds between them and the United States are such that we could never with indifference allow them to pass under the domination or exclusive control of any other power"? The great Secretary of State under President Fillmore believed "the Hawaiian Islands are ten times nearer to the United States than to any of the powers of Europe. Five-sixths of all their commercial intercourse is with the United States, and these considerations have fixed the course which the Government of the United States will pursue in regard to them."

Are these statesmanlike views less true to-day than in 1851? Shall the fears of the gentleman from Indiana "that Hawaii will be a source of irritation for all time to come;" that it may cost us something to fortify and protect it; that because it is not contiguous to our territory and its inhabitants are not homogeneous—shall such and similar fears overturn the sentiments of our greatest statesmen and change the policy of our Government that has been adhered to for more than half a century?

HAWAII NEVER BEFORE OFFERED US.

The gentleman from Indiana was misinformed when he asserted several weeks ago that in 1853 these islands were offered to

us for the mere acceptance of them and that the statesmanship of that day was sensible and patriotic enough to respectfully decline them. In August, 1853, and again in January, 1854, petitions in favor of annexation to the United States were presented to the King, and, although opposed by the missionaries and many others, the King, disheartened by the demands of foreign powers, by threats of filibusters and by conspirators at home, commanded Mr. Wyllie, his secretary of state, to ascertain on what terms a treaty of annexation could be negotiated. Acting under instructions from Mr. Marcy, our minister, Mr. Gregg completed such a treaty on August 7, 1854, but the King's death occurred before he had concluded his consideration of it, and his successor refused to ratify it. This closed all negotiations between the two countries until July 20, 1893, when a treaty of reciprocity was concluded.

AMERICA WILL NEVER CONSENT TO ENGLAND'S CONTROL.

But what do gentlemen say to the proposition that these islands, being refused by us, shall pass, upon the invitation of the Hawaiian Government, under the control of England? Would they have the United States play the part of "the dog in the manger?" Shall we decline annexation and disallow the great, protecting Anglo-Saxon arm of England to take them within her embrace? If, as gentlemen say, we do not wish to increase our Navy to defend them or our appropriations to fortify them; if their trade and their strategic position are of less value to us than the money it might cost to uphold them, why longer consider them within the Monroe doctrine?

If our view of their value has changed since the days of Webster and Marcy and Legare; if in 1881 Mr. Blaine was wrong in his statement that "the situation of the Hawaiian Islands, giving them strategic control of the North Pacific, brings their possession within the range of questions of purely American policy, as much so as that of the Isthmus itself;" if everything that has been said and done respecting these islands for half a century is wrong, then why care who owns them or controls them?

But let me say to the gentlemen that this country will never consent that the great statesmen of the past were wrong. Whatever be the cost of defending them, whatever be the fears of entangling foreign alliances, whatever be the character of their popu-

lation, their distance from the Pacific coast, or the undesirability of further annexation of territory, the people of the United States will never willingly allow England or any other country to possess or control Hawaii.

THE PEOPLE FRIENDLY TO ANNEXATION.

I can not credit the statement that the people of Hawaii are opposed to annexation. They favored it in 1854, but their king refused to ratify the treaty. In 1867 Secretary Seward feared that the reciprocity treaty would be actively opposed on the ground that it would "hinder and defeat an early annexation, to which the people of the Sandwich Islands are supposed to be now strongly inclined." "Annexation," continued the great War Secretary of State, "is in every case to be preferred to reciprocity." Secretary Fish and Mr. Blaine, although more guarded, perhaps, in their language, were of the same opinion.

The "monster petition" opposing annexation to which reference has been made is neither representative nor honest. It is well understood that it was prepared by the immediate followers of the late Queen; that the methods employed to obtain it were not of a high character, and that what it purports to show is untrue and unfounded. That the native Hawaiians, as well as half-breeds, are as friendly to annexation as the Germans, Scandinavians, and Anglo-Saxons is well understood by those who have been in position, official and otherwise, to know the true feeling that obtains upon those islands.

ITS TERRITORY NOT CONTIGUOUS.

Mr. Speaker, I do not reject annexation because Hawaii is not contiguous. Alaska is not contiguous; the Aleutian Islands are not contiguous; Midway Island, 1,200 miles west of Honolulu, which we annexed in 1867, and for the development of which we appropriated \$50,000, is not contiguous territory. When we annexed Louisiana, it was farther away from our seat of government than Hawaii is to-day.

True, it was contiguous by land as Alaska is, but no one in 1803 went to New Orleans by land any more than they now go to Alaska by an overland route. England is 2,800 miles from New York, but no one thinks of it being farther away or more difficult to reach than San Francisco. Water plowed by the modern steamship is no more of a barrier than land traversed by a modern railroad

train. In the days of Rome's greatness it was easier to reach Alexandria or Athens or Carthage than to cross into the contiguous territory of the Gauls. It was by land, too, let us remember, that the peoples came who finally conquered Rome.

CHARACTER OF THE HAWAIIAN PEOPLE.

But the principal objection to annexation seems to be to its people. The entire population of these islands is less in number than the number that sometimes passes through the gates of Castle Garden in a single month; but among them all there is not a beggar, a pauper, or a tramp. A prison may be necessary, but not a poor-house. Their producing capacity per capita is larger than in any other nation of the world. School attendance is compulsory, and instead of ignorance being the general rule and intelligence the exception, as the gentleman from Indiana charges, outside of the Japanese and Chinese, ignorance is said to be the exception and intelligence the general rule.

The gentleman admits as much when he affirms that "a monster petition has been presented by two-thirds of the native inhabitants of that island." Ignorance does not sign and present petitions upon any subject, and when two-thirds of 30,000 people can thus make themselves heard and felt, they are not to be classified or compared, as the gentleman from Indiana would have us believe, with "the ignorance, the pauperism, and the crime of the Old World," such as are excluded from our shores by a recent act of Congress.

The Chinese rushed into Hawaii when California was being filled by three times as many Orientals; but a country which under better conditions will be able to support 1,000,000, instead of 100,000 population, as now, need not fear 21,000 Chinese. The State of California, with 1,200,000 people, has no fear of its 72,000 Asiatics. In ten years, from 1880 to 1890, this class of its population fell off over 3,000.

There is no reason to believe that the Chinese of Hawaii will form an exception, for they are there only to accumulate, anxiously looking forward to the day when, having a few hundred dollars, the steamer shall return them to their own people and homes. Within ten years after the sources of supply are cut off as effectually as in the United States the Orientals of Hawaii will

be found infrequently, and then only washing the dirty linen of a superior and more prosperous people.

CHARACTER OF PEOPLE FORMERLY ANNEXED BY THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the character of the people heretofore annexed? We purchased the province of Louisiana in 1803; Spain ceded Florida in 1819; Texas was annexed in 1846; the great territory of Utah, Arizona, and California was ceded by Mexico in 1848; the Gadsden purchase was consummated in 1853, and Alaska came to us in 1867; yet not one of these cessions brought a homogeneous or desirable people. Louisiana had a few thousand Frenchmen and a few hundred thousand Indians. The population of Florida was composed of Spaniards and Indians. Texas added only Mexicans to more Spanish and Indians. With the exception of a few Americans and some Spanish priests, the cession of California brought us nothing but more Mexicans and Indians. The Gadsden purchase increased this number, while Alaska enriched us with several hundred Russians and 40,000 Arctic Indians.

Undesirable as these people were, the country survives, and no one to day would part with an inch of territory so acquired.

NO DANGER FROM LEPROSY.

But from these acquisitions we got no leprosy, I hear it said. No, but we got the yellow-fever scourge, which, under the wiser treatment and conditions of these latter days, is gradually disappearing. Under similar wise treatment and segregation now in force in Hawaii, no one sees leprosy or thinks of it, or is in danger from it. Like the leprosy of Egypt, one must inquire where it is and seek it out if he would see it. Such a reason is unworthy serious consideration.

INFLUENCE OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION.

Mr. Speaker, excluding the Chinese and Japanese, who, as I have shown, will gradually disappear of their own volition, there are about 60,000 people, men, women, and children, in Hawaii. Of these, 39,000 are native and half-breed Hawaiians—a race which, it is claimed by the opponents of annexation, is dying out. The remaining 21,000 are Anglo-Saxon, Germans, Scandinavians, and Portuguese, such people as are scattered all over our country, with whom we are familiar, to whom we do not object, and among whom we live and associate, without a thought that they are not homogeneous or desirable.

Among these 60,000 people there are to-day 195 schools in which only English is studied, and 14,000 pupils, taught by 426 teachers, receiving an average salary of \$626 per year, 46.5 per cent of whom are Americans and 26.5 are Hawaiians and part Hawaiians. Of the pupils 56.5 per cent are Hawaiians and 25 per cent Portuguese.

In 1897 the total number of children of school age (6 to 15 years) was 14,286, of whom 96.20 per cent were in school. Of the total Hawaiian population above 6 years of age, 85.28 per cent can read and write.

It is a mistake the gentleman from Indiana makes when he says these people "have not been educated as we have; that they have not our habits of thought." For seventy years they have been living under the influences of American civilization. They speak and study our language; the Stars and Stripes are as familiar as their own flag; their laws are copied from those of the United States; their rulers, whether under the Crown or the Republic, have been largely of American birth or ancestry; they know and see only United States money; the English is the language of their courts and of the educated classes, and among their holidays are the Fourth of July, Decoration Day, and Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays. Outside of the United States there is no people so American, so closely allied with our institutions, and so well acquainted with our history and our life.

In eighty years we have absorbed more than 40,000,000 foreigners, and the mixture of these races has developed a people which stands out in the world's history as the most intelligent, the most inventive, the most prosperous, and the best equipped for war or peace; a people which the world calls "American," as distinctive and homogeneous, as loyal and patriotic, as proud and as resentful of insult to their country's honor as is the Englishman or German or Frenchman. Some may not read and speak the language as readily as others; the glorious history of the past, the shaded lines between State and Federal Government, and the relation of liberty and license may not be known with equal clearness to all; but the flag is recognized, the law is respected, the school is attended, and the peace is kept better than in any other country on the globe.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 788 879 8